

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
TYLER DIVISION**

CHARLES BRYANT, #01184590	§	
VS.	§	CIVIL ACTION NO. 6:17cv109
DIRECTOR, TDCJ-CID	§	

**ORDER ADOPTING REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
OF THE UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

Plaintiff Charles Bryant, a prisoner currently confined at the Coffield Unit within the Texas Department of Criminal Justice (TDCJ), filed this civil rights lawsuit pursuant to the Religious Land Use and Institutionalized Persons Act (RLUIPA). The case was referred to United States Magistrate Judge K. Nicole Mitchell for findings of fact, conclusions of law, and recommendations for the disposition of the case.

On September 7, 2021, Judge Mitchell issued a Report, (Docket No. 94), recommending that the unopposed motion to dismiss, (Docket No. 93), be granted. The parties in this case have reached and executed a settlement agreement in this case. The Court commends the parties for working together to arrive at a mutually acceptable resolution of this case. A copy of this Report was sent to Plaintiff. To date, however, objections have not been filed.

The Court reviews the findings and conclusions of the Magistrate Judge de novo only if a party objects within fourteen days of the Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1). In conducting a de novo review, the Court examines the entire record and makes an independent assessment under the law. *Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass'n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1430 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by statute*, 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) (extending the time to file objections from ten days to fourteen days).


Here, Plaintiff has not filed objections. The Court therefore reviews the Magistrate Judge's findings for clear error or abuse of discretion and reviews his legal conclusions to determine whether they are contrary to law. *See United States v. Wilson*, 864 F.2d 1219, 1221 (5th Cir. 1989), *cert. denied*, 492 U.S. 918 (1989) (holding that, if no objections to a Magistrate Judge's Report are filed, the standard of review is "clearly erroneous, abuse of discretion and contrary to law.>").

Having reviewed the Magistrate Judge's Report and the record in this case, the Court finds no clear error or abuse of discretion and no conclusions contrary to law. Accordingly, the Court hereby **ADOPTS** the Report and Recommendation of the United States Magistrate Judge (Docket No. 94) as the findings of this Court. Therefore, it is

ORDERED that the unopposed motion to dismiss, (Docket No. 93), is **GRANTED**. Plaintiff civil rights lawsuit is **DISMISSED**, with prejudice. Finally, it is

ORDERED that any and all motions which may be pending in this case are **DENIED** as **MOOT**.

So **ORDERED** and **SIGNED** this **28th** day of **October, 2021**.


JEREMY D. KERNODLE
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE